

moon hanging low in the west over the mountains you can see from the top of your driveway. It was glowing orange and looked like a bowl that could hold something. I thought of those pictures of you and your dad. I thought of God holding the moon up there, holding your dad, holding you and your mom, holding this whole big world. It seemed like the moon was doing something else, Miah. It seemed that it was holding the hope of a lot of tomorrows. You see, as the moon falls, the sun rises on a new day. When your dad fell, it was so that you could have many more tomorrows in peace and freedom.

When I see a waxing moon glowing orange and hanging low in the west, stretching its light from South Carolina to that farm your dad loved in Montana, I'll think of you, Miah, and I'll think of your dad, and I'll pray for many tomorrows for you and for the country your dad loved.

Thank you, Miah.

Your friend, Bob.

P.S. Keep an eye on those dinosaurs in your doll tent. You know they scare me.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2701, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010, WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. ARCURI, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-419) on the resolution (H. Res. 1105) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2701) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2010 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

POLITICAL DRAMA AT THE WHITE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. AKIN. Madam Speaker, this evening we stand just before a day—tomorrow—of great political drama.

I am trained as an engineer, and not much of an expert on drama or plays, but I have at least one theory about acting in plays and drama, and that is, usually it's very good or very bad.

□ 1945

As we take a look at the drama that faces people who will be watching tomorrow, the question tonight is: What drama are they liable to watch? Are they going to watch the Olympics, the last part of the Olympics, which will be very exciting, or the political drama of 6 hours of discussions or debate? I think there will be more drama that will take place tomorrow on the health care bill.

Now, we have been talking about this health care bill for more than a year, and the subject has had a tendency to get a little bit stale, but tomorrow is an attempt to revive that discussion. One of the things that is required in good drama is the theme, or the major topic, and the different parts of that drama have to be believable. I think that's one of the things that may make the drama tomorrow more difficult in terms of its success. Let's just talk about what really is believable.

The President claimed about a year or so ago—I guess it was in a State of the Union message—that this new health care was going to save money and that it wouldn't cost us a dime. Well, I guess that's true. It's going to cost more like \$1 trillion. Is that believable?

The President repeatedly said that Republicans had no ideas. Yet, in Baltimore, just a month or two ago, he said, not that the Republicans had no ideas, but that he'd read a good number of the bills that had been introduced by the Republicans. Is that believable?

The President also pledged transparency and openness in the whole process of developing a health care bill. What we have seen has been that bills are developed behind closed doors, and for tomorrow, the bill that has been created behind closed doors is going to be revealed only for 24 hours. So is the transparency-openness pledge believable?

In Baltimore, the President talked about the fact that he has a lot of economic experts scoring the bill and taking a look at whether it works financially or not, whether or not the different component parts come together and whether or not it achieves the economic results that he wants. Yet, when the Congressional Budget Office, which is supposedly and to a large degree politically neutral, scored the bill, they said that the Republican bill actually reduces premiums by 10 percent while the Democrat bill makes them more expensive.

Then there is a question about whether or not the meeting tomorrow, which is attempting to be billed as bipartisan and bipartisanship—does that really make sense? Because, if you write a bill behind closed doors, unveiling it at the last minute, within 24 hours, and then demand that the Republicans agree to it, is that really bipartisanship? I wonder if that is believable.

The President promised us that the bill that he was going to present when

he was in Baltimore would include tort reform. Yet the bill that we have seen did the exact opposite. The States that had already enacted tort reform were forbidden from using those tort reform laws. So, in effect, it would reverse tort reform and would go in the exact opposite direction. Is that believable?

We were told that the special deals have been taken out. Yet, in a few minutes, we will take a look at those special deals which remain in the bill.

Then last of all—and it is the one that I find most amazing—the Republicans are obstructionists. I find that hard to believe how anybody could even repeat that, let alone believe it. I wish it were true. I sorely wish it were true. The Republicans here in this Chamber, my Republican colleagues, are 40 votes short of a majority. There is nothing that we could obstruct if our lives depended on it. The Democrats could lose 20 voters and still pass anything that they choose to pass. So how we could be, as Republicans, obstructionists, again, seems very hard to pass the old sniff test.

Now, it seems that the President, in setting up this great drama of 6 hours of televised discussion on health care, has made a major assumption, which is, if people just knew what was in his bill, they would really like it. Probably the opposite is true. What we have seen is our constituents, my constituents, have called in, and they have read portions of these bills. They know what is in the bill. Guess what? They don't like it. In fact, this bill that is being proposed is ugly. It's so ugly it has to sneak up on a glass of water just to get a drink. Well, let's take a look specifically at why it is that we are going to have this great health care political drama tomorrow, and yet we are not really passing the believable test. Let's just take a look to see if anything has really changed at all.

First of all, this bill imposes \$500 billion in Medicare cuts. That's a whole lot of money. Five hundred billion dollars is going to be taken out of Medicare. The old Democrat bill took \$500 billion out of Medicare. The President's new bill takes \$500 billion out of Medicare. The Republican alternative takes nothing out of Medicare. Well, nothing seems to have changed here.

This bill enacts job-killing tax hikes and government regulations, costing hundreds of billions of dollars. In the old Democrat bill, yes, that was true for it. The President's new plan, which is online, likewise enacts a lot of job-killing tax hikes and government regulations that cost billions of dollars. Yet the Republican alternative does not.

It spends \$1 trillion on a government takeover of the health care system. This is something that people are really conscious of. This is a government takeover of an entire sector of the U.S. economy—\$1 trillion. I think that number is short because it's not counting the unfunded mandates to States. The old Democrat bill does that. The President's new bill does it. The Republican